



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,541	07/27/2001	Carl D. Meinhart	1279-368	8568

7590 04/08/2003

Terri L. Sale, Esq.  
Fulbright & Jaworski LLP  
865 South Figueroa Street, 28th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

EXAMINER

CHEU, CHANGHWA J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/916,541

Applicant(s)

MEINHART ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob Cheu

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1641

### DETAILED ACTION

Amendment A filed on February 26, 2003 has been received, entered into record and considered.

The following information provided in the amendment affects the instant application:

1. Claims 1-24 have been amended.
2. Remarks drawn to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lading et al. in view of Beregovski et al. and Seul et al. are being maintained.

Lading et al. disclose a sensor chip device substantially as claimed. The device comprises a pair of lasers comprising a reference laser (7) and a sensor laser (7'), with gain region (12), mirrors (11), sample cavity (8') having an inlet for receiving a fluid and an outlet for discharging effluent and exposing to the evanescent field of laser sensor (Figure 2), heterodyne detector (4) at the juncture of the reference and sensor coherent light output sections, for detection the change

Art Unit: 1641

of refractive index of fluid in the sample chamber. Lading et al. also teach loading the surface of sensing sensor with a specific binding partner as an adsorbent for molecules to be diagnosed (claims 12-14), a microfluidics system (13) for passing a sample to the waveguides (Figure 2). However, Lading et al. do not specifically disclose placing a phase section in its sensor laser. Beregovski et al. teach using laser sensor waveguides comprising phase control, gain and grating sections in measuring environmental chemicals (Figure 1) and placing Bragg grating reflector having different sampled periods in its laser sensor (Figure 1). Such a waveguide would provide a sensor with high sensitivity, compact, low-cost and real-time sensors. (See Abstract and Introduction)

Applicants' argument filed on February 26, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants amend the instant claims and recited the "sample chamber *separate* from said phase control section." Applicants pointed out that Beregovski et al. apply the sensitive coating directly to the phase sections whereas applicants' claims all call for a "separate" configuration between sample chamber and the phase control section. Nonetheless, this similar feature appears in the primary reference of Lading et al.. (See Figure 2) The device of Lading et al has shown that the flow channels for inlet of samples (8, 8') are separate from the laser cavities (7, 7'). ✓ Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the device with Lading et al. where the sample chamber separate from the laser sensor, with the laser waveguides having phase control section as taught by Beregovski et al., in order to have higher sensitivity and lower cost for the detection of analyte in interest.

### ***Conclusion***

4. No claim is allowed.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1641

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob Cheu whose telephone number is 703-306-4086. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 703-305-3399. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3399.

Jacob Cheu  
Examiner



Art Unit 1641

\*\*\*

April 7, 2003



LONG V. LE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

04/07/03